DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 711 HE 011 559

AUTHOR Halperin, Samuel; Fischer, Kenneth C.
TITLE Final Report of the Postsecondary Education Convening Authority to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
INSTITUTION George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Inst. for Educational Leadership.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [79]
GRANT G007603919
NOTE 62p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Conferences; Continuous Learning; *Educational Policy; Federal Government; Federal Regulation; Government Role; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Information Dissemination; *Postsecondary Education; Publications; *Public Policy; State Government
IDENTIFIERS *Postsecondary Education Convening Authority

ABSTRACT

The final report of the Postsecondary Education Convening Authority, a project of George Washington University's Institute for Educational Leadership and a program supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, is presented. The objective of the project was to bring about informed public policy in postsecondary education by enabling policymakers at the state and federal levels to become better informed on important issues. During its four-year history, the project focused on four issues: the licensure/approval of postsecondary institutions by states; the respective roles and functions of the states, the Federal Government, and the nongovernmental accrediting agencies in the governance of postsecondary education; the impact of government policies on improvement efforts in postsecondary education; and the emerging federal and state role in lifelong learning. Project objectives were largely carried out through conferences and publications. The convening authority was also a sponsor of research, an issue development process, a mediator, a provider of a neutral forum, a catalyst, a networker, and an innovator in conference design. Activities involving each of these functions are described, and project outcomes are outlined. The project director's final thoughts, a chronology of major activities and publications, and commentaries on the project by others are presented. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172711

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

HE

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

FINAL REPORT

OF THE

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY

TO THE

FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 833-4737

Education Policy
Fellowship Program
(202) 223-3611

Educational Staff Seminars
(202) 296-5900

The Academic Program
(202) 785-4000

Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority
(202) 833-4748

Issues in Education
for the Public Radio
(202) 785-4662

Education of the Handicapped
Policy Project
(202) 833-4737

Family Impact Seminar
(202) 296-5130

Washington Policy Seminar
(202) 833-4091

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Grant No. G-00 7603939

July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975 . . . . .$135,000
July 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976 . . . . .$165,195
July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977 . . . . .$150,000
July 1, 1977 - September 30, 1978 . . .$141,170

Submitted by

Samuel Halperin
Director
Institute for Educational Leadership

and

Kenneth C. Fischer
Director
Postsecondary Education Convening Authority

HE 011 559

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Postsecondary Education Convening Authority (PECA) was a program of the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL). IEL, a unit of The George Washington University, is a policy planning and coordinating agency for a number of related educational programs which, taken together, seek to strengthen present and potential leadership in American education at the policy levles of state and federal government. PECA received support from the Fund for four years, beginning in July 1974 and ending in September 1978. During that time it received a total funding of $591,365.

The objective of PECA was to bring about informed public policy in postsecondary education by enabling policymakers at the state and federal level to become better informed on issues which were deserving of their attention. During its four-year history, PECA focused on four issues:

1) The licensure/approval of postsecondary institutions by states;

2) The respective roles and functions of the states, the federal government, and the nongovernmental accrediting agencies in the governance of postsecondary education;

3) The impact of government policies on improvement efforts in postsecondary education;

4) The emerging federal and state role in lifelong learning.

PECA carried out its objective largely through its convenings and publications. During its four-year history, PECA sponsored 23 invitational conferences, seminars, and workshops for 1225 policymakers, educators, and researchers. It also sponsored 24 Monthly Dialogues on Lifelong Learning, which were three-hour sessions held on Capitol Hill, open to anyone interested in lifelong learning and public policy. Attendance totaled 1440.

PECA published 47 reports, articles, and syntheses; one simulation; and one case study and has thus far distributed 43,640 copies of these publications. PECA sought to produce its publications in a form, style, and length useful to busy policymakers.

Beyond being a convenor and publisher, PECA was also a sponsor of research, an issue development process, a mediator, a provider of a neutral forum, a catalyst, a networker, and an innovator in conference design.

PECA's major outcomes included its staff development work with state licensing officials, which contributed to a more enlightened approach toward state regulation of postsecondary educational institutions on the part of some state officials; improved communication and better working relationships between the states, the federal government, and nongovernmental accrediting agencies on institutional eligibility matters; a better understanding by policymakers and educational reformers of each other's turf; and the creation of PECA's Monthly Dialogue, which played a significant role in shaping federal policy on lifelong learning.

PECA no longer exists, and it is unlikely that another project like it will soon come on the scene. Before PECA came to a close, one of its most active participants, learners' advocate and writer Ronald Gross, offered these observations about PECA's public significance:

> "PECA is one modest but authentic embodiment of the kind of public interest enterprise which Walter Lippmann envisaged, but which has rarely existed. It is a presence, a force, a facility, and an advocate for the true public interest in its arena. Knowledgable but not limited by professional, academic, political, or commercial blinders, PECA is perfectly postured to lift the level of discourse, catalyze insights and convictions, and spur action--all in the public interest. I only wish that in other sectors, other fields, other realms of social thought and action there were agencies with this same special capacity."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary 1

Table of Contents iii

I. What Was PECA? - A Description of the Project . . 1

II. Outcomes of the Project 23

III. The Project Director's Final Thoughts 28

Appendix A - A Chronology of Major Activities 31

Appendix B - A Chronology of Publications 36

Appendix C - How Others View PECA 43

I. What Was PECA? A Description of the Project

The Postsecondary Education Convening Authority (PECA) was a program of the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL). IEL, a unit of The George Washington University, is a policy planning and coordinating agency for a number of related educational programs which, taken together, seek to strengthen present and potential leadership in American education at the policy levels of state and federal government. PECA has been able to draw on the resources and networks of the other IEL projects and on the experience and knowledge of IEL staff.

The major objective of PECA was to bring about informed public policy in postsecondary education, by enabling policymakers at the state and federal level to become better informed on issues which were deserving of their attention. During its four year history, PECA focused on four issues and on seeking answers to questions raised by the issues:

1) The licensure/approval of postsecondary institutions by states.

What is the appropriate role of the states in determining whether an institution is able to operate? How does the licensure function differ from accreditation? Are licensing laws reasonable? What are the different approaches to licensure? Do the regulations which originate in legislation adequately reflect the intent of the law? What are the special problems the states face in dealing with nontraditional institutions and interstate educational programs?

2) The respective roles and functions of the states, the federal government, and the nongovernmental accrediting agencies in the governance of postsecondary education.

What are the respective roles and functions? Are these fixed? Does the eligibility system work in the way Congress intended it to? What are the problems? Are the three "triad elements" supposed to be equal? How can communication be improved? What are some alternatives to the present system?

3) The impact of government policies on improvement efforts in post-secondary education.

What are the impacts, both negative and positive, of state and federal policy on educational innovation? Which policies are obvious attempts to influence the system and which have unintentional effects? Is there a way to tie institutional outcomes and institutional performance to the state budgeting process? Do policymakers hear enough from the educational reform community in their deliberations? What is the experience of states and multi-campus systems with incentive grants to individuals, programs, and institutions?

4) The emerging federal and state role in lifelong learning.

What do we mean by lifelong learning? What is the extent of "postsecondary education" being carried out by business, government, community groups, and other sections of society not traditionally considered part of the education community? What is the appropriate federal role? State role? Who should pay for lifelong learning? How can states learn from each other's experience?

In the original proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE or Fund), IEL proposed to deal with the problem of "reconciling public demands for accountability with institutional and student demands for diversity." Within that problem, IEL proposed to investigate budget procedures,

reporting requirements, and assessment practices which government bodies imposed on educational institutions. The initial proposal carried a brief description of each issue and identified a developmental process involving task forces, conferences, and publications that would deal with each issue.

The initial proposal suggested that this entire process would be completed within the year and that a new set of issues would be identified and developed during the subsequent year.

What actually happened was not quite so neat and tidy. The project officer at the Fund, Russell Edgerton, had in mind that PECA ought to give attention to issues that other organizations had not yet identified as issues or, if they had, had given them low priority. The first thing PECA's new staff --Ken Fischer as Director and Wendy Martin as Coordinator--did was invest an enormous amount of time becoming familiar with the issues. Determining which issues would be developed during the four years of PECA was a process which involved Fund staff, PECA staff, and a network of "PECA friends" from government, associations, and institutions. Obviously, there were many issues which PECA could have selected for development. The ones that were chosen met several criteria which PECA staff felt were particularly important:

1) The issue must be significant, both from the standpoint of public policy and the improvement of postsecondary education;
2) The issue should be on the upcoming decision calendars of policymakers;
3) The issue should involve problems which are not getting enough attention by policymakers and which others are not adequately developing.

In addition to these criteria for selection of issues, several operating principles have also guided the Convening Authority since its inception:

1) The Project will take a neutral stance with respect to the issues in question in order to develop a full range of available decisions options;

2) The Project sees value in the substantive and interactive dimensions of convenings. PECA is concerned not only about putting better information in the hands of policymakers, but also with facilitating the development of relationships among those in the policy networks;

3) The Project will seek to identify new faces among educators, researchers, and public officials;

4) The Project's written outcomes--articles, reports, and papers--will be written in a form, style, and length useful to policymakers.

Appendix A is a chronology of major PECA activities, including its 23 convenings, during its four-year history, and Appendix B is a chronology of its 49 publications. Each appendix is arranged by issue category. Each of PECA's convenings is identified by topic, date, place, and number of participants. Each of PECA's publications is identified by date of publication, title, author, and estimated number of copies distributed through December 1978. One way to get a sense of PECA is to review these lists of activities and publications.

Another way to understand PECA is by the roles and functions it fulfilled:

1) PECA as a sponsor of convenings: This was PECA's most obvious role--an organization that ran conferences, workshops, seminars, retreats, and other convenings. PECA was the sole sponsor or co-sponsor of 23 convenings between April 1975 and July 1978. It also sponsored 24 Monthly Dialogues on Lifelong Learning between January 1976 and June 1978. Attendance totaled 1225 at the 23 convenings and 1440 at the Monthly Dialogues. The convenings ranged in attendance from a low of 10 to a high of 185. Most of the

conferences were held in retreat sites in Maryland, Virginia, Colorado, Florida, and California, in order to increase productivity, enhance interpersonal relationships, and reduce distractions. In nearly all of the convenings, PECA was responsible for all aspects of the planning, design, program development, and management. All PECA convenings were invitational. Its Monthly Dialogue, however, was open to anyone interested in participating.

2) PECA as a publisher: PECA published 49 documents between April 1975 and August 1978. Its total distribution of publications thus far totals 43,640. The publications fall into these categories:

a. conference reports - 16
b. research reports - 6
c. reports of sessions of the Monthly Dialogue on Lifelong Learning - 12
d. Legislative Updates presented at the Monthly Dialogues on Lifelong Learning - 10
e. case study - 1
f. simulation - 1
g. compilations - 3

The number and range of publications far exceeded what was originally anticipated in IEL's proposal to the Fund. It was expected that PECA would publish the reports of the two or three conferences per year that it was expected to sponsor. Obviously, PECA has done more than that. Because its convenings were invitational, PECA sought to share the results of what happened with a larger audience through well-written and concise reports. PECA began to distribute its conference reports and other publications free of charge but the number of publications and level of interest became substantial enough to require charging an amount that would cover production and distribution

costs. When the Monthly Dialogue meetings began in 1976, reports of these sessions were originally free of charge to persons on the Monthly Dialogue mailing list. But by early 1977, the mailing list had grown to over 1,200 persons, and Project staff felt that they could no longer provide these reports free as well. So, beginning in the fall of 1977, reports of the Monthly Dialogue were made available only on a subscription basis for $10 per year.

Officials of state and federal government continued to receive the material free of charge. PECA printed a publications list in 1976 and has updated it as new publications became available. The publications list was distributed widely in PECA and IEL mailings. PECA also used the occasion of its own conferences or those of other organizations to promote its publications. Thus far, PECA has received over $5,000 from publications sales. Requests continue to come in. PECA's major reports are listed in the ERIC/Higher Education bibliographic system.

3) PECA as a sponsor of research: Although PECA was never intended to be a research entity, it did sponsor four research projects, the results of which were expected to contribute to the better understanding of a particular issue and which could be completed quickly. The four research projects were as follows:

a. Government Funding Policies and Nontraditional Programs, by Richard Meeth, was commissioned in the spring of 1975. The publication has had four printings and over 4,100 copies have been distributed. PECA was looking for some way to identify the range of problems that nontraditional programs had with certain state and federal government funding policies, to examine the impact of such policies, and to discover

ways in which the programs were dealing with them. Fewer than eight weeks took place between the time Meeth was commissioned to do the work and the distribution of the first draft for review.

b. Report on Institutional Eligibility, by the IEL Eligibility Task Force. Soon after PECA was established, its director visited the principal staff members of the House and Senate higher education authorization committees and asked how an organization like PECA might be helpful to them. An issue that seemed to perplex each of the staff members was the issue of institutional eligibility. The principal problem for the staff was that there had been so much written about the subject in the past few years but they had no time to read the lengthy research reports. PECA then appointed a four-member task force of skilled writers who, in a two-week period, reviewed the basic literature on institutional eligibility and synthesized it into a two-volume report. The first volume was the report itself and was less than 20 pages. The second volume was a sizeable appendix which provided backup documentation. In addition to the report itself, PECA sponsored two seminars for Congressional staff. The first seminar was held prior to the task force review of the literature so that staffers could identify their major problems and questions. The second seminar was held two weeks later for the purpose of reviewing the draft report. PECA did not distribute the task force report beyond the Congressional staffers and key actors in the eligibility system; however, it was soon made available in the ERIC/Higher Education bibliographic system for anyone interested.

c. The Incentive Grant Approach: A Fifteen-Year History, by Martin Finklestein was commissioned in the spring of 1975 to provide useful data for PECA's conference on "State Funding of Postsecondary Education: Incentives for Improvement," held in San Francisco in July 1975. Finklestein was a graduate student at the State University of New York at Buffalo and, using the telephone, worked intensively for six weeks to gather data on the use of incentive grants in each of the 50 states. PECA did a second printing of the Finkelstein report and has thus far distributed about 2,300 copies.

d. The PECA Task Force Report on Lifelong Learning was published in early 1977. It was based on material gathered by PECA's four-member task force in a two-month period in 1976. Again, the work of the task force was intensive and was designed to inform both Congressional staffers and conferees at a national conference on lifelong learning about the wide range of educational opportunities offered in the non-collegiate sector.

4) PECA as an issue development process: PECA's conferences and publications didn't just happen. They were in a long series of activities which usually included these steps:

a. Discovery: This is when an issue presents itself to PECA as something the staff ought to give some serious consideration to developing. This discovery happened in a variety of ways. On the lifelong learning issue, it was largely the presistent efforts of Norman Kurland from the state of New York as he urged IEL to take the issue seriously enough to devote some of its resources to it. The licensure issue

was of particular concern to Fund staff member Russell Edgerton, and it found its way into IEL's proposal to the Fund. The eligibility issues emerged after PECA staff had worked nearly a year with state licensing officials, who expressed interest in meeting with their federal and accrediting counterparts.

b. Issue Clarification: This was typically a lengthy process involving literature searches, intensive reading by staff, interviews by staff of key resource people, brainstorming sessions in IEL's conference room, meetings between Fund staff and PECA staff, and eventually, an attempt to write down what the issue was all about.

c. Development of Action Plan: This step was sometimes concurrent with, but usually followed, the issue-clarification stage and resulted in decisions on how PECA could best invest its resources in further developing the issue. Because of the particular nature of IEL and of PECA's emerging characteristics, we tended to think most about how we could best bring together the right people from both the government policymaking community and the education community to move the issue forward. On several occasions, it was felt that certain data ought to be gathered prior to a convening, thus PECA commissioned its research reports. The action plan was not typically a long-range one. The four years in which PECA existed were busy ones for the Congress and for state legislatures. Thus there were many unexpected and unanticipated developments that PECA wanted to accomodate and that would have brought havoc to any long-range planning.

d. Planning Committees for Specific Projects: PECA made extensive use of planning committees for each of its activities. Where PECA was

one of several sponsors of a convening, officials of the other sponsoring groups always participated fully. Where possible, representatives of groups to be invited to the conference were invited to join the planning committee. This procedure helped assure that the conference would indeed meet the needs of the group PECA was trying to serve.

e. The Event Itself: PECA sought to make the objectives of its activities clear and known well in advance. The objectives became the criteria against which the program components were developed and by which evaluations were designed. Most conferences closed with a conference synthesis followed by a session on "Where Do We Go From Here?" where suggestions for next steps were solicited from conference participants.

f. Postconference Debriefing: The planning committee was usually reconvened following the event, and the recommendations and suggestions from the synthesizer and those from the floor were evaluated. PECA staff sought concensus from the planning group as to where it might best put its energies for future activities. Had the issue been resolved? Was work still needed? If so, did it make sense for PECA to do it or would it be best passed on to another group?

5) PECA as a mediator: PECA made a conscious effort not to take sides on the issues it chose to develop. It sought to remain as neutral as possible. This characteristic enabled PECA to intervene on issues where there were two or more points of view and where resolutions were unlikely to take place without third-party intervention.

PECA was able to function effectively in the eligibility arena because it could bring together representatives from the states, the federal govern-

ment, and the nongovernmental accrediting agencies, and do so with credibility. In addition to mediating between these groups at its own conferences, PECA staff was invited on several occasions to chair or moderate sessions at conferences sponsored by other groups where representatives from each of the three interest groups was on the platform.

Another example of PECA's role as mediator was its sponsorship of a small invitational seminar on a project sponsored by the Council on Post-secondary Accreditation to establish evaluative criteria and procedures for the accreditation of nontraditional education. PECA staff enjoyed close relationships with both the accrediting community and with the nontraditional educational community. When it learned from COPA of its grant proposal to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to support the study, PECA staff was concerned that the lack of involvement by educational reformers in the proposed project could result in a discrediting of COPA's efforts by the educational reform community. PECA intervened, proposed to hold a conference that would involve all interested parties, and received an endorsement from COPA to move ahead. COPA did, in fact, receive the grant and before the study got underway, PECA held a two-day seminar which involved leaders from the accrediting community, key persons from the educational reform community, leading researchers in quality assessment, and other interested parties. Among the specific outcomes of the meeting was the appointment by COPA of a project advisory committee, including presidents and other officials of nontraditional educational institutions.

6) <u>PECA as a provider of a neutral forum</u>: This feature was touched on in the above section on PECA as a mediator. It could be a successful mediator only because it provided a neutral forum where all points of view could get

exposure. This feature was essential to PECA's credibility with public officials. It was a feature shared by its parent organization, the Institute for Educational Leadership, and has been a key to its success over the years. Kenneth Young, President of the Council of Postsecondary Accreditation, who has been an active participant in PECA activities on the issues of licensure and eligibility, wrote:

> "I want to emphasize how important I think it is to have an organization that is perceived as a neutral body with regard to important problems and issues, that can identify situations that call for collective consideration and/or action, and that can function to convene disperate interest groups who would otherwise not come together. Time and again PECA has demonstrated its unique value in playing this role."

7) PECA as a catalyst: PECA often tried to use its limited resources to get people and organizations moving in positive ways. As noted earlier, PECA's intervention in the COPA study on nontraditional education resulted in the creation of an advisory committee of leaders from the educational reform community which ultimately contributed to a better, more credible study. Another way in which PECA served as a catalyst was to encourage attendance at PECA meetings and conferences sponsored by other groups by providing "incentive funding" to government officials, particularly state-level education officials and legislators. Many states have restrictive policies regarding out-of-state travel. If PECA thought the participation of a particular state official was important, it held out the "carrot" of a partial travel subsidy. Knowing that they could get at least some of their expenses covered by PECA, state officials were nearly always able to

shake loose the remaining dollars from the state. In addition, by providing only a partial rather than full subsidy, PECA was able to help many more people and spread its dollars around more broadly.

8) PECA as a networker: One of PECA's major functions was to connect people with one another. This was done most directly at the convenings it sponsored but was also done in its everyday operation. PECA staff maintained an up-to-date rolodex, a directory of all of its conferences' participants, and an extensive set of files on resource persons by subject category. PECA was, in effect, a mini-nexus on the four issues it dealt with. Not only did PECA staff respond to numerous phone and mail inquiries, but they made interventions that they thought would be useful, such as recommending resource people to conference organizers. In all its convenings, PECA tried to affirm people, believing that each person has contributions he or she can make. Annotated directories with complete addresses and phone numbers were commonplace in PECA conferences as well as "round-the-table" introductions. These and other PECA "networking" techniques contributed to better communication both during and after the conferences.

9) PECA as innovator in conference design: PECA tried to challenge what it felt were unproductive conventional practices and initiate techniques which would result in more effective learning for conferees. PECA staff is pleased that many of its techniques are now being used by other organizations at their meetings. Some of the techniques included:

a. conference synthesizer - a person who is both a skilled writer and knowledgable about the conference subject who becomes the "eyes and ears" of the convening and prepares an oral synthesis at the conclusion of the meeting and a written synthesis within a few days following

the meeting. In this way, conferees have a brief conference report in their hands immediately following the meeting instead of having to wait months for the conference proceedings.

b. preconference interviews - telephone interviews conducted w th confirmed participants prior to a convening. Interviewers learned about each confe:ee's present job responsibilities, the kinds of needs and resources he or she were bringing to the conference, and other related information. These data enabled PECA staff to eliminate "guess work" as it put together an agenda which accurately met the needs of conferees.

c. annotated directory - a directory of all conference participants, including detailed address and phone numbers and their responses to several questions, such as those asked in preconference interviews.

d. "Portrait Gallery" - the newsprint or other material taped to the wall of a meeting room, which includes photographs of the conferees plus affiliations, and lists of their information needs and resources. Conferees used the "portrait gallery" between sessions to link themselves together with other conferees.

e. linking service - a technique used to schedule informational sessions during meals and other free time in a convening. Conferees fill out a card upon arrival which identifies "what I want to know" and "what I want to share with others." Conference planners then schedule special sessions for conferees whose cards suggest they ought to get together.

f. interview format - PECA has made extensive use of the interview format as an alternative to prepared presentations by speakers. PECA staff found that the informality and spontaneity of the interview process maintained audience interest far longer and with greater intensity

than the traditional podium presentation. The truly outstanding speaker is a rarity yet many people have something useful to say. The interview format enables resource persons to share what they know but puts someone else, the interviewer, in charge of the "process."

g. dramatic presentations - An alternative to podium-style presentation, the dramatic presentation is used when, in the estimation of the conference planning committee, learning will be more effective and other conference objectives, such as community-building and modeling of good practices, are important. A scenario is written that communicates the problems or issues pertinent to the conference, and the conference participants are used as members of the cast. It has worked with great success on two occasions. It resulted in effective learning, held the attention of the audience, and was entertaining.

h. physical and other logistical arrangements - PECA typically used round tables rather than theater style to promote more effective interaction; provided continuous refreshment service, including fresh fruits and juices, in addition to the usual fare; selected retreat sites where conferees have a less distracting environment in which to interrelate.

10) PECA as "agent/patron": PECA gave visibility to a lot of new faces among educators, researchers, and policymakers. PECA staff was in a position to put hundreds of people on planning committees, conference programs, and advisory groups and tried to seek out people with fresh ideas, regardless of how well-known they might be. While PECA may have helped some people gain professional recognition, it also booked musicians into many PECA convenings to provide an aural respite from the intensive discussions.

It should be pointed out that the funds to support such musical interludes did not come out of the Fund grant.

Case Study of the Issue Development Process

The previous section has identified some of the characteristics which have given PECA a unique capacity in issue development. The process by which this capacity was applied to issues was a complex synergy of subtle dynamics and sensitivities. To help the reader better understand this process, a case study demonstrating the issue development process is included, beginning with the point at which the issue is identified by PECA.

The licensure of postsecondary education institutions by states, especially as it related to the licensure of nontraditional institutions, was identified by PECA in collaboration with the Fund as an issue in urgent need of development. The first stage of dealing with this issue was for PECA staff to equip itself with substantive information on the nature and extent of the problems. This was done through extensive reading, conference participation, and talking with a number of individuals knowledgable in this area. PECA then hosted a "brainstorming" session in Washington with a group of leading state licensing officials. This initial group determined that the state officials who license degree-granting institutions were fragmented and needed to give attention to many critical problems which they had in common, including issues in nontraditional education. The "brainstorming" session yielded a subsequent broader planning meeting of six reform-minded state licensing officials who formulated the objectives, program and agenda for what was to become the Airlie Conference on State Licensing of Private Degree-granting Institutions.

Simultaneous with catalyzing this planning effort, PECA, through interviews with Congressional staff involved in writing the 1976 higher education legislation, identified their informational needs concerning the issue of eligibility. To respond to their need for better information on this important policy issue, PECA appointed a four-member task force to synthesize the literature on eligibility, held two seminars for the Congressional staff, and published a two-volume report, the first volume of which was a short, tightly worded document including a range of alternatives to the present system and the second a volume of back-up documents.

The PECA-sponsored Airlie Conference, held on July 10-12, 1975, marked the first time that state officials who license degree-granting institutions met as a group. The results of this convening were far-reaching as this group had its first opportunity to share similar problems, exchange valuable information, and establish credibility with each other. Not only did this type of communication establish relationships between officials with mutual needs and resources, it also gave the group national visibility. This greater visibility brought numerous invitations to licensing officials to serve on advisory panels to federal agencies and private accrediting groups and to speak at many association meetings. Previously, these officials had not participated in such forums, largely because few people knew they existed.

Out of the Airlie Conference Report came the PECA publication Approaches to State Licensing of Private Degree-granting Institutions. This report presented a collection of research and data pertaining to the licensure of degree-granting institutions as well as a comprehensive roster of the licensing officials in each state. Each member of the planning committee was given the opportunity to edit the draft of the report, which was prepared by Theodore Marchese of Barat College, and to provide input for its format before its wide distribution. This process assured the accuracy of the report. About 2,000 copies of Approaches have

been distributed through December 1978.

Following the Airlie Conference, PECA held another meeting of the planning group to consider the next steps in developing the licensure issue. PECA, through continuous research and consultation with experts, had by this stage ascertained the integral roles of the other two groups of state licensing officials, the National Association of State Administrators and Supervisors of Private Schools (whose members license non-degree-granting institutions) and the National Association of State Approval Agencies (whose members approve programs for veterans). PECA was also developing a relationship with the new Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, the national organization which represents the interests of the country's regional and specialized accrediting groups. Additionally, PECA was maintaining communication with the USOE Accreditation and Institutional Eligibility Staff through meetings and telephone contacts.

At the post-Airlie meeting, the state licensing officials expressed an interest in a second meeting, after the report had been disseminated, to act upon the recommendations from the Airlie meeting. It was at this point that PECA added a new dimension to the licensure issue.

PECA, through its relationship with the other regulatory groups, became aware that there were major problems in the functioning of the governance triad in postsecondary education which was comprised of these federal, state, and nongovernmental accrediting interests. To bridge the communication gap between representatives of triad elements and to work towards a more effective system of governance, PECA sponsored the Belmont conference in January 1976, which brought together key representatives of the triad and noted authorities on licensure, eligibility, and accreditation. The Belmont conference marked the first time members of the triad had ever come together to discuss their own problems, each others' problems, and to achieve a new level of communication.

It also gave the leaders of the Airlie Conference an opportunity to act on several of the recommendations from that conference. A synthesis of the Belmont retreat by William Kaplin was given wide distribution.

The effects of Belmont did not stop with the establishment of these new lines of communication. As a direct outcome of Belmont, PECA hosted a planning meeting to put together a professional staff development workshop for all groups of state licensing officials, which was held in Keystone, Colorado in the summer of 1976. PECA invited the Education Commission of the States to underwrite the costs of all research efforts related to the workshop. ECS accepted, and commissioned Florida State University's higher education department to produce four research reports on various aspects of the licensing process. The event was another "first" in that it brought the three groups of state licensing/approval officials together for the first time. One of the unique components of the week-long workshop was the playing of a five-hour simulation, commissioned by PECA and developed by Frederic Jacobs of Harvard, which simulated the process by which a state licensing agency determines whether or not to license a non-traditional institution. Role-reversal was a feature of the simulation--licensing officials became institutional administrators and students, and the institutional representatives became site-visit team members. The simulation is now available for general distribution and has been played on at least five other occasions.

The Keystone meeting led to further networking. Key licensing/approval officials were appointed to an advisory committee for the American Institute for Research's study of State Oversight of Postsecondary Education which was just getting underway. Discussions began on the possible formation of a national organization for all persons involved in institutional approval. Most everyone thought that a "Keystone II" would be worthwhile and, before Keystone I adjourned, an official from USOE committed its Division of Eligibility and

Agency Evaluation to contributing substantial funds toward it. Most everyone agreed that the convening of Keystone II should occur when the AIR report would be ready for distribution.

The year following Keystone I was one of little activity by PECA on this issue. PECA's energies went into its work on lifelong learning and nontraditional education and into its search for non-Fund support. Several things did occur, however. PECA provided an office for Bill Kaplin, a law professor on sabbatical, who had written extensively on institutional regulation, in return for Bill's writing occasional memos and letters in response to inquiries by licensing officials on the recently enacted Education Amendment of 1976. PECA staff also organized and chaired sessions on this issue at conferences of the Education Commission of the States and the American Association for Higher Education. PECA also maintained informal contact with the principal actors on this issue through conferences, phone calls, and appointments.

It became clear to PECA staff after a round of conversations with federal, state, and accrediting agency officials in the summer of 1977 that a second meeting of the "triad" was needed to take stock of the present institutional eligibility system. It would also provide an occasion for PECA to "pass the torch" to other groups or organizations to assume its catalytic, convening, and publishing roles when its Fund grant expired the following year.

A September meeting called "Breakers I" provided this opportunity and resulted in the decision of USOE and ECS to co-sponsor a follow-up to the Keystone Conference, selection of a conference planning committee, the decision to prepare a staff development proposal for state licensing officials, and the founding of a newsletter for all institutional approval officials, called TRIAD. PECA would have a small role in proposal preparation and in producing TRIAD, but other organizations assumed the major responsibility.

Since Breakers I, USOE and ECS co-sponsored an outstanding conference in Colorado Springs where the results of the AIR study were discussed and other staff development activities for licensing officials were conducted; the staff development proposal was prepared by a committee of six Breakers I participants but has not yet received funding; and the first issue of TRIAD was produced jointly by CCSSA, NATTS, and PECA and distributed widely.

PECA expects that the momentum it helped create on this issue will continue as other organizations step in. None has the "disinterested third-party" character of PECA, but such neutrality may not be as essential now as it was at the beginning of the development of this issue.

Fund Support of PECA

PECA received two two-year grants from the Fund with amounts as follows:

July 1, 1974 - June 30, 1975	$135,000
July 1, 1975 - June 30, 1976	$165,195
July 1, 1976 - June 30, 1977	$150,000
July 1, 1977 - September 30, 1978	$141,170
TOTAL	$591,365

PECA Staff

Kenneth C. Fischer served as PECA Director throughout the duration of the project. Wendy Martin was Project Coordinator through December 1975. Marilyn Kressel joined the staff as Project Coordinator in January 1976, became Associate Director in July 1976, and remained with the project through August 1978. Project secretaries included Melinda Smart, Rebecca Pagan, and Nancy Mykut.

II. OUTCOMES OF THE PROJECT

This section is a listing of achieved outcomes, arranged by issue category, which PECA has accomplished or facilitated in its four-year history. Each outcome listed is either a statement of historical fact; a statement of opinion commonly held by PECA participants as evidenced in letters to the staff of PECA, IEL, or the Fund; or a statement of impact from a third-party evaluation report. The reader is encouraged to look at Appendix C--"How Others View PECA"--which is a collection of excerpts from 36 of the several hundred letters which PECA has received from persons who have participated in its programs.

A. The licensure/approval of postsecondary educational institutions by states.

1. Channels of communication have been opened between state officials who license degree-granting institutions. As one official wrote: "Thanks to PECA, I now have a personal contact in practically every state."

2. A body of knowlege about the condition of the state licensing scene has been assembled and disseminated widely.

3. Several reform-minded degree-granting institutional regulators have emerged as a result of PECA activities and are providing national leadership for their colleagues throughout the country.

4. Some licensing officials jointly developed a proposal to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education requesting staff assistance to perpetuate the research efforts and to enhance the cooperative relationships among licensing officials which PECA initiated.

5. Of the three priority issues licensing officials have selected for intensive development, two related to their need to better understand

education innovations: nontraditional institutions and degree programs operating across state lines. As licensing officials better understand these enterprises, they will be able to make better informed judgments about them.

6. Key leaders of the three national groups representing state licensing and approval officials worked together for the first time on a national project--the PECA-sponsored staff development workshop at Keystone in 1976. Since then they have worked together on three other national projects: PECA's "Breakers I" conference held in September 1977, the state oversight study undertaken by the American Institutes for Research, and the USOE/ECS conference on state oversight held in July 1977.

7. The states--previously identified as the weak link in the governance triad behind the federal government and nongovernmental accrediting interests--are becoming more effective as chartering and licensing authorities, because state officials, through activities such as those PECA sponsored, are better equipped to perform their functions for the public interest.

8. A simulation--"Open College of America," commissioned by PECA and developed by Fred Jacobs of the Harvard Graduate School of Education in 1976--is available as an imaginative and effective learning tool to help educational reformers and institutional regulators better understand the complexities of each other's turf.

9. PECA convenings and publications have been useful to government and private research projects, such as the GAO and AIR studies of institutional regulation. Wrote one such researcher: "The information we obtained during the formal sessions, as well as informally, was very pertinent to our study and will be most helpful in completing our work."

B. The issue of the respective roles and functions of the states, the federal government, and the nongovernmental accrediting agencies in the governance of postsecondary education.

1. The complex issues in institutional eligibility were synthesized into a report of a form, style, and length which busy policymakers could use. Major problems in the eligibility system were analyzed and a range of alternative solutions were presented.

2. Congressional staff members have been able to develop better-informed legislative proposals on institutional eligibility.

3. Improved communication, better understanding of respective roles and functions, and commitment to cooperative action were three outcomes of the Belmont seminar in 1977 and its follow-up, the "Breakers I" seminar, in 1978 for the governance "triad" in postsecondary education--the states, the federal government, and nongovernmental accrediting agencies.

4. The Education Commission of the States has taken up PECA's invitation to assume PECA's former convening role for the triad and, in partnership with the U.S. Office of Education, sponsored a "Keystone" follow-up in Colorado Springs during the summer of 1978. This move helps assure that what PECA has begun on this issue will continue under responsible leadership.

5. A newsletter entitled "Triad" was published jointly in 1978 by PECA, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, and the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools as a communication channel for all persons involved in institutional approval. The newsletter is a way of expanding the dialogue far beyond those who have attended PECA convenings.

6. The states are approaching a status equal to that of the accrediting agencies and the federal government in the governance triad. This is an

important development toward bringing about a better balance of responsibility in the eligibility system. PECA has had a principal role in providing professional development opportunities for the staffs of state agencies which carry out this function.

C. The issue of the impact of government policies on improvement efforts in postsecondary education.

1. Key state and federal policymakers--legislators, legislative analysts, budget officers, and governors' aides, congressional staff, and federal agency officials--have been exposed to many innovations in postsecondary education, the problems faced by these innovations brought on by government policies, the people who have created these reforms, and a number of alternative policies and practices which promote rather than inhibit improvements in postsecondary education.

2. Nationwide state leadership organizations, such as those co-sponsoring the San Diego conference, are now investing staff and program resources on the reform of postsecondary education financing when only a short time ago such an issue was not among the priorities of these organizations.

3. Many leading educational reformers now have a better understanding of the state and federal policymaking process, have personal contacts with influential policymakers, and can therefore use the process more effectively to promote educational improvements.

4. There is now the Coalition for Alternatives in Postsecondary Education (CAPE), a coalition of 16 national organizations committed to educational reform, which is now representing the interests of learners to the federal government and in a variety of forums throughout the country. PECA was the catalyst and facilitator in bringing this coalition into being.

D. The issue of the emerging state and federal role in lifelong learning.

1. The Education Amendments of 1976 contain the Lifelong Learning Act and, while it was never PECA's objective to create a piece of legislation, PECA's Monthly Dialogue on Lifelong Learning is generally acknowledged as being a major factor in both the development and passage of the Act. The Dialogue helped assure that the broadest coalition of interest groups helped shape federal policy on lifelong learning.

2. State officials with responsibilities for developing state-wide plans for lifelong learning know their counterparts in other states, know what other states are doing, and can avoid "reinventing the wheel."

3. Policymakers and educators have greater insight into the wide range of learning opportunities available outside of formal educational institutions.

4. PECA's Monthly Dialogue enabled not only those attending it but the 1,200 who were on its mailing list to keep abreast of new developments in lifelong learning, including up-to-date information on federal legislative and administrative developments. Said one high-ranking HEW official: "The PECA Dialogue sessions . . . for the adult education community were the best thing that has happened in that area in years. . . We learned what was going on in Washington and who was doing it."

E. Miscellaneous outcomes.

1. PECA's intervention on COPA's study of nontraditional education resulted in the creation of an advisory committee of key persons form the educational reform community whose subsequent participation in the study added both important substantive contributions and credibility to the COPA effort.

2. PECA's innovations in conference design, programming, and management have been adopted widely by numerous organizations for their conferences.

III. The Project Director's Final Thoughts

I'm sorry that PECA is no longer around. The existence of a disinterested third-party that could bring together people who didn't see eye-to-eye on various issues was a good thing. I'm sure postsecondary education will survive without it, but I have less certainty about whether certain actors in the system will talk to each other and whether certain issues that the Fund and other reform groups care about will get much attention.

Private foundations don't seem to have much interest in funding a rather free-wheeling organization like PECA. They require in proposals the specifics of who, what, when, where and how of activities that will take place, say, two years hence. One of PECA's greatest assets was its flexibility--it could be immediately responsive to new developments on the Hill, in the states, or in the field, and it could initiate conferences or publications with little or no hassle. A phone conversation or quick lunch with Fund staffers, Russell Edgerton or David Justice to check out an idea was all that was needed. The Fund was an ideal funding agent for a project like PECA.

I regret that the Fund does not distinguish between a PECA or a NEXUS on the one hand and its campus-based improvement projects on the other when it comes to funding strategy. In my view, PECA, NEXUS, and other nationally-focused projects which give visibility to learner-centered improvements; which put educational reformers in touch with policymakers, researchers, and other educators; which perform effective dissemination; and which, by their nature, cannot be self-sustaining, ought to receive the support of the Fund on a continuing basis, much as NIE supports its laboratories and ERIC Clearinghouses. Such projects ought to be viewed differently from the one-shot campus-based improvement projects that probably ought not to be given more than three years of Fund support

before the institution or some other funding agent should be expected to pick up the tab.

I recall Ted Marchese's synthesis at one of the Zion project directors' meetings when he identified PECA as a "second generation" Fund project, suggesting that one of PECA's roles is to help assure the continued existence of Fund-supported projects by creating a political climate at least tolerant of, if not supportive of, educational reform. I think we were performing this function extremely well and would have continued to do so had funding continued. I wonder now who will help licensing officials, accreditors, federal eligibility staff, state legislators, and Congressional staff to better understand and appreciate the nontraditional sector of postsecondary education.

But now is no time for sour grapes. For four years I had an absolute ball. My friends said I had the best job in higher education; I know I had at least one of the best. I worked for a boss, Sam Halperin, who gave me lots of room. The same goes for my two Fund project officers, Russ Edgerton and Dave Justice. I was able to get involved enough with four important policy issues to see my project have some positive impact on them. Most importantly, however, I had the chance to work closely with scores of educators and public officials who genuinely care about improving learning opportunities for all citizens. The quality of the interaction was such that these people are no longer just professional colleagues. They have become valued personal friends.

For a final word on PECA's significance--what difference did it make in the long run--I'd prefer to let five of PECA's most active participants comment on that. You'll find excerpts from letters by James Heffernan, Ronald Gross,

Matthew Quinn, David Trivett, and Theodore Marchese at the beginning of Appendix C. Four of these five are gifted writers who served as synthesizers at PECA conferences. I think it only appropriate to give them the last word.

-- Kenneth C. Fischer

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 350
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 833-7137

Education Policy
Fellowship Program
(202) 223-36

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 293-3100

The Associates Program
(202) 785-0991

Postsecondary Education
Convening Authority
(202) 833-7547

'Options in Education'
and National Public Radio
(202) 785-4642

Education and The Washington
Policy Process
(202) 833-7137

Family Impact Seminar
(202) 296-5130

Washington Policy Seminar
(202) 833-4951

Appendix A

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY

A CHRONOLOGY OF MAJOR ACTIVITIES DURING PECA'S FOUR-YEAR HISTORY

Kenneth C. Fischer
Director

Marilyn Kressel
Associate Director

Prepared for PECA's Final Report
to the
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

December 1978

A Chronology of Major PECA Activities

1. The licensure/approval of postsecondary education institutions by states.

   a. Convened first conference of state officials who license degree-granting institutions, Airlie Conference Center, Warrenton, Virginia, July 1975. 38 participants.

   b. Commissioned and disseminated Approaches to State Licensing of Private Degree-Granting Institutions, the first primer/handbook directory on the state licensing of degree-granting institutions, November 1975. About 2,000 copies of the report have been distributed.

   c. Co-sponsored with the Education Commission of the States a staff development workshop--"Keystone I"--for all state officials who have a licensing function--the degree-granting institution regulators, the proprietary school regulators, and the Veterans Approval Agency staff members at the Keystore Conference Center, Keystone, Colorado, July 1976, and disseminated conference synthesis by Theodore Marchese and five papers, September 1976. 90 participants.

   d. Commissioned Fred Jacobs to design "Open College of America," a simulation of the process by which a state licenses a nontraditional degree-granting institution, Spring 1976, and published the simulation for general distribution, Spring 1978.

   e. Cooperating Organization, Conference on State Oversight of Postsecondary Education Institutions--"Keystone II"--at the Four Seasons Hotel in Colorado Springs, July 1978. 185 participants.

2. The respective roles and functions of the states, the federal government, and the nongovernmental accrediting agencies in the governance of postsecondary education.

   a. Appointed a four-member task force which synthesized the literature on institutional eligibility into a two-volume report and distributed copies to congressional staff and federal agency officials, April-June 1975.

   b. Convened two seminars for staff members of the House and Senate education authorization committees on institutional eligibility issues, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 44 participants.

   c. Convened for the first time in a neutral forum the key representatives of the governance "triad" in postsecondary education--the states, the federal government, and private accrediting agencies at the Belmont Conference Center, Elkridge, Maryland, January 1976. 28 participants.

   d. Commissioned and disseminated "Towards a Development of the Triad Concept: A Synthesis of the Belmont Retreat on Institutional Licensure, Eligibility and Accreditation," by William Kaplin, February 1976.

   e. Convened "Breakers I," the second retreat on the "triad," at the Breakers Hotel in Palm Beach, Florida, September 1977, and disseminated Richard Millard's synthesis and other conference reports, February 1978. 32 participants.

f. Published the initial issue of TRIAD, an eight-page newsletter for people interested in quality assurance in postsecondary education, in conjunction with the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation and the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, Spring 1978.

3. The impact of government policies on improvement efforts in postsecondary education.

a. Commissioned and disseminated Government Funding Policies and Non-Traditional Programs, by Richard Meeth, now in its fourth printing, June 1975. About 4,100 copies of the report have been distributed.

b. Co-sponsored with College IV of The Grand Valley State Colleges, a retreat for educational innovators and state legislators, at the Interlochen Center for the Arts in Interlochen, Michigan, June 1975. 10 participants.

c. Co-sponsored with the Fund and Education Commission of the States a conference on "State Funding of Postsecondary Education: Incentives for Improvement," at the Clift Hotel in San Francisco, California, July 1975. 78 participants.

d. Commissioned and disseminated The Incentive Grant Approach in Higher Education: A 15-Year Record by Martin Finkelstein, now in its second printing, December 1975. About 2,300 copies have been distributed.

e. Co-sponsored with the Education Commission of the States, the National Conference of State Budget Officers, Legis 50, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, and the National Governors' Association, a national seminar on "Innovation, Outcomes, and the State Budget Process" at the Hotel del Coronado in San Diego, California, March 1976, and disseminated conference reports by Marvin Peterson and others, May 1976. 51 participants.

f. Commissioned Fred Jacobs and George Weathersby to write "Capitol Community College of Montana," a fictional case study based on a real situation involving the attempt by forces in a state legislature to close a nontraditional community college, Spring 1976, and published the case study, Fall 1976.

g. Co-sponsored with the Education Commission of the States, the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and other organizations a conference on "Non-traditional Education: State-Level Issues and Concerns" at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts, May 1976, and disseminated conference report by Theodore Marchese, Fred Jacobs, and George Weathersby, February 1977. 88 participants.

h. Convened two organizing meetings to help establish the Coalition for Alternatives in Postsecondary Education, now a free-standing coalition of eleven full-member organizations and five associate organizations, at the Belmont Conference Center, Elridge, Maryland, November 1976 and February 1977. 50 participants.

i. Published and disseminated two papers commissioned by the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning and authored by Michael Goldstein and Robert Sexton on federal policy and experiential learning, January 1978.

j. Convened meeting of key federal agency representatives to discuss HEW's interest in dealing with the unintentional effects of public policy on reform in postsecondary education, at the Marvin Center, The George Washington University in Washington, February 1978. 10 participants.

k. Convened federal officials and representatives of the reform community in postsecondary education for a two-day seminar on "Public Policy and Reform in Postsecondary Education," at the Belmont Conference Center, July 1978, and disseminated conference report, August 1978. 25 participants.

4. The emerging federal and state role in lifelong learning.

a. Co-sponsored with the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education, the U.S. Office of Education, a retreat to identify major policy issues in lifelong learning, at the Airlie Conference Center in Warrenton, Virginia, November 1975. 20 participants.

b. Sponsored the first meeting of directors of state studies of adult learning needs at the Belleview Biltmore Hotel in Clearwater, Florida, January 1976, and published synthesis of the conference and bibliography by James Heffernan, February 1976. 36 participants.

c. Sponsored a "Monthly Dialogue on Lifelong Learning" for anyone interested in public policy issues in lifelong learning. Between January 1976 and June 1978, 24 meetings of the Dialogue were held in the Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. An average of 60 persons attended each session, with attendance reaching to 150 during 1976 when the Lifelong Learning Bill was enacted. Reports of each session were sent to the Dialogue mailing list which included up to 1,200 persons in 1976-77.

d. Commissioned and disseminated a compilation of "Federal Programs Supporting Lifelong Learning," by Pam Christoffel, September 1976.

e. Co-sponsored with The Coalition of Adult Education Organizations a national invitational conference on "Lifelong Learning in the Public Interest" at the Wingspread Conference Center near Racine, Wisconsin, October 1976. 50 participants.

f. Commissioned and disseminated a paper on "Lifetime Distribution of Education, Work, and Leisure," by Fred Best and Barry Stern, December 1976. The paper has been reprinted in numerous journals and magazines.

g. Sponsored "PECA Task Force on Lifelong Learning," a journalistic appraisal of the educational components of 150 organizations and institutions not traditionally associated with the American postsecondary education establishment, Spring 1976, and published and disseminated the Report of the PECA Task Force on Lifelong Learning, January 1977. About 1,300 copies of the report have been distributed.

h. Co-sponsored with the Education Commission of the States, the National Center for Educational Brokering, the Florida Department of Education, and the Florida State University a conference on "State Planning for Lifelong Learning: Improving Access for All Citizens," at the Howard Johnson's Hotel in Orlando, Florida, February 1977. 123 participants.

i. Co-sponsored with the Education Commission of the States, the College Board, and the National Center for Educational Brokering a national invitational conference on "Educational Information and Counseling Services," at the Cosmopolitan Hotel in Denver, Colorado, February 1978. 176 participants.

5. Miscellaneous

a. Sponsored a "meeting-on-meetings" to help convenors of educators improve the quality of their meetings, at the IEL offices in Washington, April 1975. 38 participants.

b. Sponsored a retreat for officials of funding agencies and key persons in state leadership organizations to identify new targets of opportunity for postsecondary education at the state level, at the Belmont Conference Center, Elkridge, Maryland, November 1975. 20 participants.

c. Sponsored a seminar for representatives of accreditation, non-traditional education, and research projects on innovation to review plans for the Council on Postsecondary Accredition's project to establish evaluative criteria and procedures for the accreditation of nontraditional education, at the Cross Keys Inn in Columbia, Maryland, June 1977. 33 participants.

d. Served in a consulting capacity to IEL's Carnegie project, which synthesized for policymakers the 140 documents produced during the ten-year history of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Summer and Fall '978.

e. Served as a nexus of information on conference centers and as a consultant to convenors seeking advice on how to design and administer meetings.

f. Served as a broker to link educators and policymakers on a variety of issues and a wide range of forums.

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 676-5900

Education Policy
Fellowship Program
(202) 676-5925

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 676-5966

The Associates Program
(202) 676-5931

"Options in Education"
over National Public Radio
(202) 787-3690

Education of the Handicapped
Policy Project
(202) 676-5910

Family Impact Seminar
(202) 296-5330

Washington Policy Seminar
(202) 676-5960

Fund Fellows in
Educational Journalism
(202) 676-5901

Appendix B

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY

A CHRONOLOGY OF PUBLICATIONS DURING PECA'S FOUR-YEAR HISTORY

Kenneth C. Fischer
Director

Marilyn Kressel
Associate Director

Prepared for PECA's Final Report
to the
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

December 1978

CHRONOLOGY OF PECA PUBLICATIONS

I. On the issue of the licensure/approval of postsecondary education institutions by states.

Date	Description	Approximate Number of copies distributed through December 1978
11/75	Approaches to State Licensing of Private Degree-Granting Institutions: The Airlie Conference Report. The first primer/handbook/directory on state licensing of degree-granting institutions. 70 pages	2,000
9/76	"Synthesis of the Keystone Workshop for State Licensing and Approving Officials," by Theodore Marchese, Director of Institutional Research, Barat (Illinois) College. 10 pages	400
9/76	"Licensing/Approval Organization Structure for the Fifty States Covering Private and Proprietary Degree-Granting and Non-Degree-Granting Institutions," by Louis Bender, Professor of Higher Education, The Florida State University. 11 pages	400
9/76	"Remarks on Consumer Protection Issues," by Robert V. Bullock, Assistant Attorney General, State of Kentucky. 3 pages	400
9/76	"Postsecondary Education and 'The Best Interests of the People of the States'," by Richard M. Millard, Director, Postsecondary Education Department, Education Commission of the States. 9 pages	400
9/76	"Consumer Protection Issues in Postsecondary Education," by Reginald Watkins, Staff Attorney, National Association of Attorneys General. 8 pages	400
4/78	Open College of America, a simulation by Frederic Jacobs, Harvard Graduate School of Education; OCA is a five-hour simulation of the process by which a state licenses a non-traditional degree-granting institution. There is a Participant's Manual and an Instructor's Manual.	400

II. On the issue of the respective roles and functions of the states, the federal government, and the nongovernmental accrediting agencies in the governance of postsecondary education.

5/75	Report of the IEL Eligibility Task Force, by Patrick Dolan, Fred Pinkham, Paul Shapiro, and David Trivett. This special two-volume report was written expressly for	25

Date	Description	Approximate Number of copies distributed through December 1978
	Congressional staff members preparing new legislation dealing with the eligibility of postsecondary education institutions to participate in federal student aid programs. Volume I is 20 pages; Volume II is 68 pages.	
2/76	"Toward a Development of the Triad Concept: A Synthesis of the Belmont Retreat on Institutional Licensure, Eligibility, and Accreditation," by William Kaplin, Professor of Law, Catholic Univeristy School of Law. 12 pages	350
9/76	"The Triad is Not Alive or Well!" by William A. Fowler, Executive Director, National Home Study Council. 11 pages	400
10/77	"Synthesis of the Breakers I Seminar," by Richard Millard, Director, Postsecondary Education Department, Education Commission of the States. This is the report of PECA's second seminar on the eligibility triad. 5 pages	200

III. On the issue of the impact of government policies on improvement efforts in postsecondary education.

6/75	Government Funding Policies and Nontraditional Programs, by L. Richard Meeth, Professor of Higher Education, State University of New York at Buffalo. This study examines the problems which certain state and federal policies create for nontraditional programs. Subsequent printings in 7/75, 10/75, 4/77. 18 pages	4,100
8/75	"Improvement of Higher Education in a Period of Little or No Growth," by Clark Kerr, Chairman, Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. This was the keynote address at PECA's 1975 conference on "State Funding of Postsecondary Education: Incentive for Improvement." 11 pages	200
12/75	The Incentive Grant Approach in Higher Education: A Fifteen-Year Record, by Martin Finkelstein, State University of New York at Buffalo. This is the report of a study of the use of incentive grants by states and multi-campus systems to promote educational improvements. Second printing in 3/76. 56 pages	2,300

Date	Description	Approximate Number of copies distributed through December 1978
6/76	Reform in the State Budgeting of Postsecondary Education. This publication includes reports by Marvin W. Peterson on PECA's 1976 San Diego seminar on "Innovations, Outcomes and the State Budgeting Process," and by Russell Edgerton on PECA's 1975 San Francisco conference on "State Funding of Post-secondary Education: Incentives for Improvement." 36 pages	500
6/76	"Who Wants Outcome Measures and Why Do They Want Them?" by John Folger, Education Commission of the States. 17 pages	500
6/76	"Legislative Review: War, Peace, or Armed Truce," by Howard Klebanoff, Connecticut State Legislator. This paper has been reprinted in several publications. 8 pages	500
6/76	"Introducing Higher Education Outcome Information into the State Planning and Budgeting Process," by Sidney C. Micek, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. 17 pages	500
12/76	"Capitol Community College of Montana: A Case Study of State Support and Delivery of Educational Services During a Period of Retrenchment," by Frederic Jacobs and George Weathersby, Harvard Graduate School of Education. The case study also includes an instructor's pamphlet. The case study is 38 pages; the instructor's pamphlet is 9 pages.	125
3/77	"Nontraditional Education: State-Level Issues and Concerns," a reprint from the Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin of a report of a conference which PECA co-sponsored with the HGSE and other groups in 1976. It contains articles by George Weathersby, Frederic Jacobs, Samuel Gould, Theodore Marchese, Jerome Lord, Ralph Dungan, and James Furman. 16 pages	340
12/77	"Federal Policies Toward Experiential Learning," by Michael Goldstein, attorney with Dow, Lohnes, and Albertson in Washington, D.C. This paper was commissioned by the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning (CAEL). 16 pages	1,700

Date	Description	Approximate Number of copies distributed through December 1978
12/77	"The Institutional Response to Federal Policy in Experiential Education," by Robert F. Sexton, Executive Director, Office of Experiential Education, Univeristy of Kentucky. This paper was commissioned by CAEL. 13 pages	900

IV. On the issue of the emerging state and federal role in lifelong learning.

3/76	"A Synthesis of the Clearwater Conférence for Directors of State Studies of Adult Education," by James M. Heffernan, Assistant Professor, Department of Higher Education, Syracuse University. 10 pages	600
3/76	"Bibliography of the Ad Hoc Library at the Working Conference for Directors of State Studies of Adult Education," compiled by James M. Heffernan, Syracuse University. 6 pages	150
9/76	"Federal Programs Supporting Lifelong Learning," compiled by Pam Christoffel, College Entrance Examination Board. This is a listing of 275 programs which support lifelong learning, the House and Senate committees that have jurisdiction over the programs, and the OMB catalog number for each program. 23 pages	2,100
10/76	"A National Strategy for Lifelong Learning," by Norman Kurland, New York State Education Department. This report of a 1976 Monthly Dialogue presentation has been reprinted in several publications. 14 pages	1,400
12/76	"Lifetime Distribution of Education, Work, and Leisure: Research, Speculations, and Policy Implications of Changing Life Patterns," by Fred Best of Quality of Life Research Associates and Barry Stern of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This article, developed from a 1976 PECA Monthly Dialogue presentation, has been reprinted in numerous publications. 61 pages	1,900
12/76	"Interview with Philip Austin and Virginia Smith on the Implementation of the Lifelong Learning Act." This is a transcript of a 1976 Monthly Dialogue interview conducted by PECA's Marilyn Kressel with Philip Austin, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Education, and Virginia Smith, Director of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. 17 pages	1,500

Date	Description	Approximate Number of copies distributed through December 1978
1/77	Annotated Directory of the PECA Monthly Dialogue on Lifelong Learning. 47 pages	550
1/77	"Presentation by Chester Francke and Ralph Frederick on Education and Career Development at General Motors Corporation." Francke and Frederick are executives in human resource development and gave their presentation at a 1977 Monthly Dialogue. 15 pages	1,300
2/77	Report of the PECA Task Force on Lifelong Learning, by Barbara Hodgkinson, Peg Kaplin, Ian McNett, George Nolfi. This is journalistic appraisal of the educational components of 150 organizations and institutions not traditionally associated with the American post-secondary education establishment. 77 pages	650
3/77	"Legislative Update--March, 1977," by Janet Carl. This report on current legislative activity regarding lifelong learning became a regular Monthly Dialogue feature at this time. 3 pages	1,200
4/77	"Legislative Update--April, 1977," by Janet Carl. 4 pages	1,200
5/77	"Synopsis of the May 2 Monthly Dialogue featuring Ray Salman, Director of Professional Licensing, New York State Education Department, and Bill Draves and Sue Maes, Free University Network." Salman spoke on continuing professional education and Draves and Maes talked about the free university movement and grass-roots education. 4 pages	1,200
6/77	"The Independent, Self-Directed Learner in American Life: The Other 80% of Learning." This is the transcript of a 1977 Monthly Dialogue featuring learner-advocates Ronald Gross, Thomas Herbert, and Allen Tough. 42 pages	1,500
11/77	"Legislative Update--November, 1977," by Ellen Hoffman. 4 pages	800
11/77	"Remarks by Richard Fulton." This is the transcript of an interview between PECA's Marilyn Kressel and Richard Fulton, attorney with Sachs, Greenbaum, and Tayler, on his experience as trial counsel in Wayne State University vs. Veterans Administration. 10 pages	800
12/77	"Legislative Update--December, 1977," by Ellen Hoffman. 3 pages	800
1/78	"Adult Learning and the Future of Postsecondary Education," by Warren L. Ziegler and Grace M. Healy, Syracuse University Research Corporation. 35 pages	800

Date	Description	Approximate Number of copies distributed through December 1978
1/78	"Legislative Update--January, 1978," by Ellen Hoffman. 3 pages	800
2/78	"Legislative Update--February, 1978," by Ellen Hoffman. 3 pages	800
2/78	"Where Do We Go From Here in Lifelong Learning." This is the transcript of an interview between PECA's Marilyn Kressel and HEW officials Charles Bunting, Peter Relic, and Penny Richardson, on the status of implementation of the Lifelong Learning Act. 23 pages	850
3/78	"Legislative Update--March, 1978," by Ellen Hoffman.	800
3/78	"Adult Learners in the Context of Adult Development: Life Cycle Implications for Nontraditional Education," by Timothy Lehmann of Empire State College, and Virginia Lester of Mary Baldwin College. 21 pages	900
4/78	"Legislative Update--April, 1978," by Ellen Hoffman. 4 pages	800
5/78	"Legislative Update--May, 1978," by Ellen Hoffman, 3 pages	800
5/78	"Educational Technology: Close Encounters with Lifelong Learning." This is a transcript of an interview between PECA's Marilyn Kressel and resource persons on educational technology Douglas Bodwell, Susan Fratkin, Gene Gage, and Hal Morse. 23 pages	800
6/78	"Legislative Update--June, 1978," by Ellen Hoffman. 3 pages	800
6/78	"Lifelong Learning and Public Policy: Implications for Older Adults." This is a transcript of an interview between PECA's Marilyn Kressel and resource persons Pam Christoffel, Esther Colvin, Ed Cox, Rick Moody, and Sandra Timmendan. 25 pages	800

To sum up, PECA published 49 documents in its four-year history and has thus far distributed approximately 43,640 copies.

INSTITUTE FOR
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP

THE
GEORGE
WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY

Suite 310
1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Samuel Halperin
Director
(202) 676-5900

Education Policy
Fellowship Program
(202) 676-5925

Educational Staff Seminar
(202) 676-5945

The Associates Program
(202) 676-5935

"Options in Education"
over National Public Radio
(202) 785-5600

Education of the Handicapped
Policy Project
(202) 676-5910

Family Impact Seminar
(202) 296-5130

Washington Policy Seminar
(202) 676-5960

Ford Fellows in
Educational Journalism
(202) 676-5901

Appendix C

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION CONVENING AUTHORITY

HOW OTHERS VIEW PECA:

EXCERPTS OF LETTERS FROM PECA PARTICIPANTS

DURING ITS FOUR-YEAR HISTORY

Kenneth C. Fischer
Director

Marilyn Kressel
Associate Director

Prepared for PECA's Final Report
to the
Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

December 1978

This appendix includes excerpts from thirty-six of the several hundred letters which PECA staff have received following its convenings and publication of its reports over the project's four-year history.

The first section of general comments are excerpts from letters written by five persons who participated in a wide range of PECA activities and whom PECA staff asked in the fall of 1977 to reflect on the project's development and significance.

The next four sections contain excerpts of letters on PECA's activities and publications in each of its four issue categories.

The final section includes comments on PECA's miscellaneous activities.

I. Reflections on PECA's history and significance by five of its most active participants.

"PECA has grown from its original role of facilitator to something of a mini think tank. Not only can you and your staff respond quickly to arising needs by bringing together best minds on a topic, but, on your own, you can and have contributed ideas of substance and significance to various issues you have addressed, such as non-traditional education, state licensing, and adult education to name but a few. . . In addition to having such strengths, you also have the advantages of not being locked into an organization or a long-term commitment to an issue, once the problem has been reasonably discussed and resolved. You have the flexibility to move into and out of an area quickly and without a lengthy start-up period or phase-out period. I would imagine that this aspect of your organization would be particularly attractive to foundations since a substantial amount of their grant would flow directly into achieving the ends desired, rather than having to be funneled into direct costs, overhead, and unnecessary staff."

-- Matthew J. Quinn
Director
Office for State Colleges
State of New Jersey

"You've been providing a service unlike any of the other FUND projects, and, for that matter, unlike any in the entire postsecondary field. You've done far more than any national association or any national conference could ever do to bring together in a neutral setting the various and disconnected parties related to important issues. I continue to marvel at the way you can move in on an emerging issue, pull together the experts, the practitioners and the constituencies involved, and establish a productive, "sleeves-rolled-up" kind of workshop atmosphere."

-- James M. Heffernan
Associate Professor
Syracuse University
Coordinator of Research and
Bulletin Editor
National Center for Educational
Brokering

"Two inherent characteristics of PECA have come to stand out in my mind. . . The first is that PECA is truly able to function in the public interest. It does not have a vested interest, it is not skewed in its mission by extrinsic governmental directives, it does not lean towards one or another institutional viewpoint of one special sector of education or society. Only an agency set up on such a basis can do this. . . Which brings me to the second point: PECA's particular enterprise and style. In a field beset by internecine conflicts, PECA has created oases of disinterested concern and shared intelligence. It has provided a forum where vested interests may enter into authentic dialogue,

where partial people may seek a larger sense of what is needed and what is possible. . . Perhaps my conviction is best expressed by saying that I have seen and heard how PECA has added to the strength of people and institutions to do the best that is possible in this field. . . Finally, the public significance of all this. I believe PECA is one modest but authentic embodiment of the kind of public interest enterprise which Walter Lippmann envisaged, but which has rarely existed. It is a presence, a force, a facility, and an advocate for the true public interest in its arena. Knowledgeable but not limited by professional, academic, political, or commercial blinders, PECA is perfectly postured to lift the level of discourse, catalyze insights and convictions, and spur action--all in the public interest. I only wish that in other sectors, other fields, other realms of social thought and action--and I get to monitor a number of them as coordinator of Writers in the Public Interest--there were agencies with this same special capacity and anything like the high competence and zest you bring to the task."

-- Ronald Gross
Associate Professor of Social Thought
(adjunct)
New York University

"I have slowly learned that in the infrastructure of education the real trade is in people with ideas and programs. Anything that promotes the mutual identification of interests and talents contributes to that commerce. Surely, countless valuable connections have been established in the round robin identification of each Lifelong Learning Dialogue. These are synergistic contacts that enable people with problems to meet people with solutions. . . A different service occurs at convenings such as Belmont. Here we have contending, even hostile, parties who may realize that their suspicions and communication blockages are impeding the flow toward constructive action but whose human reserve, pride, and bureaucratic sense of status constricts an impulse to reach out. Accreditors blame state licensing people who resent the accreditors; both fear and despise the Feds; all poke fun at the V.A., and no one talks with others. . . PECA activities . . . seduce participants into talking with each other, into seeking the other side, maybe even into assuming momentarily the postures and stance of another side in an issue. This facilitation is achieved through gimmicks--interviews with contending chiefs, biographical sketches, O.D. charts and agendas. But, the result is that people talk with each other, insight results, progress occurs. Most PECA convenings seem to lead to more meetings, which is exactly what should happen. Appropriate settings, conviviality, music, well conceived arrangements all expedite these breakthroughs. . . As a representative of the drier side of educational communication--the written word--I am continuously amazed at the achievement from any one PECA session."

-- David A. Trivett
Research Associate
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher
Education
(deceased)

"Every PECA meeting I've been to has obviously needed to occur (and wouldn't otherwise) and has had a calculated purpose. One of the best things you've done is to start with an issue or problem and gone through a screening routine of asking, how important is it?, what is its nature?, what change or action is desired as an outcome?, and, only then, would the right convening be a helpful intervention at this point? . . . PECA is justly famous for the quality of its conferences, but the key to impact, I think, has been this careful work beforehand and in follow-up. The Airlie venture with state licensing officers is the best example: that meeting worked because political groundwork had been laid before the fact and because you were able to take the excitement of those three days and translate them into a valuable set of materials, then into a new organization, then into a broadened convening (at Keystone), then into a follow-up action within individual states. . . Taking licensing as an example, I think a very good cost-benefit case can be made for the Convening Authority, especially as compared with the research/policy-study/commission model. So many of the latter seem to be formed, operate for a couple of years, spend a quarter of a million dollars, and wind up putting a report on the shelf. However wise or prescient the recommendations, too little seems to happen as a result. If I may draw a somewhat unfair comparison, USOE is plowing $200,000 right now into an AIR study of state oversight, to compile what essentially will be a refined status report which hardly anybody will see or even notice. I doubt PECA spent a fifth that amount on the licensing issue, and look at all that's happened since. Similarly, I'd love to see a comparison of consequences following from the hundreds of thousands spent of lifelong learning commissions as against the few tens of thousands put to work on the same issue through PECA convenings. We do need study, knowledge, and wise counsel, of course, but more than that imaginative mechanisms geared to diffusion and implementation, such as PECA. . . Unlike a commission, which forms and disbands, PECA by its nature strengthens itself with each succeeding venture. The more you network and earn your way to the center of movements, the greater your ability to impact on the next. Critical to this is your strategy of bringing key people into contact with issues hitherto ignored (licensing, lifelong learning) but which they are in a position to influence. It turns out, of course, that many of these same people--already served by and now very much aware of PECA--are the very ones you'd call upon for next rounds of issues. And right now, PECA knows more key state, federal, and association officials on a direct, first-name basis than virtually any other single office, Washington or elsewhere. The perspective I'm underscoring is that of PECA as a developed capacity--one with knowledge and influence in relation to problems already addressed, but more importantly one with the contacts, techniques, and high repute to impact on a next set of problems."

-- Theodore J. Marchese
Director of Institutional Research
Barat College

II. On the issue of the licensure/approval of postsecondary education institutions by states.

"The conference was more helpful than you can imagine. Neither I nor any other members of our staff had had any experience with licensing functions or with state responsibilities regarding proprietary institutions. I feel that the conference gave me a general feel for the area. I now understand the basic concepts and philosophies involved in this licensing function much better. I learned some specific hints, some of which could have been learned through experience only at great cost. Further, I now have the names and addresses of most of the individuals in the United States who are engaged in the same function and should I be confronted with an application from another state, in all probability, I can call the individual in that state and exchange information."

-- Tom Spencer
Assistant Director for
Community Colleges
Arkansas Department of
Higher Education

"I consider my participation in the working conference for state licensing officials sponsored by the Convening Authority one of my most constructive activities during the past year of the Nebraska 1202 Commission. The conference truly was a working one and the contacts made and the information gained contribute to my feeling that it was time well spent."

-- Carolyn Lee
Nebraska 1202 Commission

"Everyone I talked to who attended the recent conference on state licensure at Airlie was unusually impressed by the effective planning and coordination which made the conference such a notable success. Those of us who have or anticipate responsibilities in this field will profit from our experience for a long time to come."

-- Kerry Davidson
Assistant Commissioner for
Academic Affairs
Louisiana Board of Regents

"It was the first time I was aware that others, working in the same capacity in which I work in Pennsylvania, have similar problems with the same organization. . . A major outcome of the meeting to me is that now I have a contact person in practically every state with whom I can converse when the need arises. . ."

-- Warren D. Evans, Chief
Division of Graduate and
Professional Education
Pennsylvania Department of
Education

"PECA has also strengthened, and, in some cases, created a positive relationship between state agency regulators of private institutions and persons representing innovative programs and colleges. At Keystone, for example, the site-visitation, and the sessions on institutions operating on an interstate basis, and the evaluation of non-traditional institutions as well as tennis at 6:30 a.m. each morning served to open lines of communication and understanding between regulators and those being regulated. . . Finally, I wish to mention the research which PECA has sponsored for state licensing officials. As you know, with the exception of a few authors, there was a dearth of research available relating to the approving and licensing of nonpublic institutions. The Airlie Report, utilizing the synthesis prepared by Ted Marchese; the Belmont papers and Bill Kaplin's work; the Keystone papers by Lou Bender, Dick Millard, Bill Fowler, Robert Bullock, and Reginald Watkins have provided state officials and others with current data and enriched the literature in the area."

-- C. Wayne Freeberg
Executive Director
Florida State Board of Independent
Colleges and Universities

"As my counterparts and colleagues from 30 other states demonstrated at the conference, we are grateful to you, the Institute for Educational Leadership, and to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education for your support and assistance in providing a forum through which we could exchange information and ideas on state licensing and approving of private, degree-granting institutions."

-- Arlene McCown
Special Assistant for Licensure
District of Columbia Board of
Higher Education

"The workshop at Keystone was great. I certainly appreciated the opportunity of attending and want to thank PECA for making it possible. . . The conference was really worthwhile and I received many fine ideas and suggestions to assist me in improving operations in Ohio."

-- Frank N. Albanese
Executive Secretary
Ohio Board of School and
College Registration

"I'm pleased to see that you've been able to get people together to not only 'talk' but 'listen' as well. Hopefully we can bring some sense into a chaotic state of affairs."

-- William Wright, President
American School
Chicago, Illinois

"The interplay and interrel[illegible]ionships amongst participants, the attempt to meet each person's personal goals and the availability of resource persons with desired expertise all contributed to the success of the workshop. I personally felt professionally rewarded through my participation and as I reported, so did my planning group."

-- Thom[illegible]s J. Pekras
Vice President
National Association of State
Administrators and Supervisors
of Private Schools

"I thought the conference was excellent. It was well organized and met my objectives well. I think the unplanned accomplishments were the icing on the cake--such as NASASPS and the degree-granting people talking about forming a single association and NASASPS attending the National Association of Attorneys Generals meetings."

-- Deborah Louison
South Dakota Department of
Education and Cultural Affairs

"On behalf of Nick White and myself, I would like to express our appreciation for the opportunity to attend the Keystone Workshop. The information we obtained during the formal sessions, as well as informally, was very pertinent to our study and will be most helpful in completing our work."

-- Thomas N. Medvetz
Audit Manager
U.S. General Accounting Office

III. <u>On the issue of the respective roles and functions of the states, the federal government, and the nongovernmental accrediting agencies in the governance of postsecondary education</u>.

". . . as a neutral authority only [illegible]CA could have created the necessary environment and brought together the prin[illegible]al representatives of the various interest groups in order to discuss in a productive way the thorny, complex, but promising subject of cooperative effort between state government, federal government, and the private sector. You made a significant contribution, and I hope that PECA can continue to function as a Convening Authority in this important area. Much remains to be done if we are ever to realize the potentials of the 'triad' concept."

-- Kenneth Young, President
Council on Postsecondary
Accreditation

"The mere fact that you brought together in one room some of the key representatives from the federal government, state governments, and the accrediting agencies who deal with postsecondary education was in itself an accomplishment. To create an atmosphere in which these parties (who are sometimes hostile towards each other) could candidly, good-naturedly, and honestly discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the system, deserves high praise. Only in such an environment can progress be made."

-- Matthew J. Quinn, Director
Office of Independent Colleges
and Universities
New Jersey Department of Higher
Education

". . . the service rendered by you as a convening agent commendably satisfies the demonstrated need for a neutral field to which 'combatants' can be brought together for a productive dialogue. This was certainly the case at Belmont. What a refreshing delight to be subjected to long hours of arduous yet extremely fruitful interchange! You are to be commended on your diligent efforts in our behalf. Again, thank you most sincerely for this unique experience in learning."

-- Sterling Provost, President
National Association of State
Approving Agencies, Inc.

"Just a note to express my admiration for the job you did in organizing and leading the recent Breakers conference. I must say you had a difficult chore in getting 30 or more prima donnas to agree, but I thought you pulled it off with marvelous aplomb. . . Incidentally, I think the key result of the conference was the assignment of leadership functions for continuing the work that PECA so ably has so ably begun. Congratulations!"

-- Thomas W. Carr, Director
Defense Education
Office of the Assistant
Secretary of Defense

IV. <u>On the issue of the impact of government policies on improvement efforts in postsecondary education</u>.

"Now that the Coalition for Alternatives on Postsecondary Education has been successfully launched, I would like to express my appreciation and admiration for the way in which you and the Institute played a facilitating and catalytic role in enabling this Coalition to come into being. . . In a sense this is a case in which the results speak for themselves; but do let me add a comment on some features of your work which were so effective. One of the things that was most important about your activity was that you provided very tangible encouragement without permitting the nontraditional organizations to thrust the ultimate responsibility upon you rather than continuing to hold it themselves. Your

knowledge/ability about how to do the kind of thing they were attempting to do proved invaluable as the planning of the two meetings took place, and this effectiveness was further manifested in the actual conduct of those two Belmont meetings. You also derived a great deal of mileage out of a very small financial outlay, it seems to me, in that you assisted only those who could not cover costs themselves; and you avoided any ongoing financial commitment. Behind all of these things was your early recognition of the need for the kind of association which this Coalition represents and your assistance to the group in sorting out exactly what the purposes and priorities of such a group should be."

-- Morris T. Keeton
Executive Director
Council for the Advancement of
Experiential Learning

"You are to be commended for a first rate conference, the only one dealing with issues of postsecondary education governance and finance which I have found to be realisitic in conception, valid in implementation."

-- James Browne
The Associates Program
Institute for Educational Leadership

"Thank you for the invitation to the San Francisco Conference. It was a valuable event for many participants. The unusual mix put together in a neutral setting with the right amount of common information is powerful."

-- Dean Honetschlager
Director
Human Resources Planning
State of Minnesota

"I should like to thank you again for having organized a very interesting meeting and for having invited me to attend. I came back with greater insight into not only issues relating to the subject matter of the meeting but also--and perhaps more importantly--the ways, language, and values by which people in education policymaking deal with them."

-- Joseph D. Olander
Special Assistant to the
Commissioner for Postsecondary
Education

". . . The support of the Postsecondary Education Convening Authority has been critical in moving this idea forward (the development of the Coalition for Alternatives in Postsecondary Education). I believe what is emerging from the Belmont Conference will be a genuine force for pulling together the efforts of leading national groups in the area of alternatives in postsecondary education. This conference demonstrates how PECA fills a most important need. My thanks to you and to your hard-working staff."

-- John R. Valley, Director
Office of the New Degree Programs
Princeton, New Jersey

"I am writing this letter to express my appreciation to PECA for another well organized meeting. Once again you have afforded us the opportunity to participate in a valuable, highly productive event. . . As you know, PECA meetings have contributed greatly to our ability to develop and maintain important contacts in Washington, and in advocating for our concerns and the perspectives of our membership to other organizations and individuals in policy positions."

-- C.P. Zachariadis
Executive Director
Clearinghouse for Community-Based
Free Standing Educational
Institutions
Washington, D.C.

"Thanks for your incredible organizing and coordinating efforts at the Postsecondary Education Convening Authority in facilitating the gathering of educational organizations in postsecondary education, whose expressed purpose is to establish an organizational work of agencies developing new directions in education. . . As you well know, as a result of that meeting in December, the Coalition for Alternatives in Postsecondary Education is well on its way to becoming a reality. Hopefully this body will provide the needed direction, support, strength and facilitation for the exciting educational alternatives developing around us. Certainly the cooperation and strength these groups can bring to each other and the educational movement as a whole will certainly benefit each of us in putting our efforts to their maximum creativity."

-- Sue C. Maes
Director
University for Man
Manhattan, Kansas

V. <u>On the issue of the emerging federal and state role in lifelong learning</u>.

"It seems to me that such issue-oriented sessions are best accomplished by 'neutral convenors' rather than special interest advocates. The setting/environment that you created contributed in a large measure to the success of the enterprise. . . My learnings will be employed as we work with the fifty state agencies in further planning for the education of adults."

-- Eugene Welden, Chief
Community Service and Continuing
Education Program
U.S. Office of Education

"Let me note a few things that, from my perspective, made the Clearwater conference successful. It is often the case at educational conferences that pertinent issues are not discussed in meaningful detail. This is due, probably, to the educator's penchant for philosophical discourse. Your conference avoided this precisely because you and Marilyn and the planning committee foresaw this type of obstacle

and planned carefully to avoid it. The pre-conference interviews, participants' 'photo-billboards,' scheduling of sessions, careful recording of proceedings, Jim Heffernan's role as synthesizer, plentiful resource materials, the relaxed setting, all added up to make the difference between a flaccid get-together and a lean productive conference. I've put on conferences in the past at a multi-state level, and probably will again; I hope you don't mind if I plagiarize some of your planning techniques."

-- Michael E. Randall
Educational Planner
State of Washington

"Frankly, I had not expected to gain a great deal in terms of immediate legislative usefulness but that was not the case. On the contrary, I learned some things about the state of the ar in state studies and planning which may prove very useful in the consideration of pending legislation."

-- Charles Radcliffe
Minority Counsel
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Education and Labor

"I wish to express my strong support for and appreciation of the excellent work that is being done by the Postsecondary Education Convening Authority. It has made a major contribution to the development of the national dialogue on lifelong learning. The recent convening of persons involved in studies of lifelong learning will, I'm sure, be a milestone in the development of our understanding in this field."

-- Norman D. Kurland, Director
Study of Adult Education
New York State Department of Education

"In my years with NCHEMS I have learned to appreciate the value of bringing together people representing a broad spectrum of ideas, interests, and concerns. Your conference provided those who spend their time in the trees to stand back and survey the dimensions and nature of the forest, while those who are always surveying the forest had a chance to see what it was like in the trees. I'm sure this was a unique opportunity for all concerned."

-- Douglas J. Collier
Senior Staff Associate
National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
Boulder, Colorado

"This is the second year in a row that I have had the opportunity to participate in a national workshop where PECA under your leadership has provided vital linkages with counterparts across the country. To share ideas on state planning for lifelong learning with other statewide planners was very useful to me and will be helpful for public higher education in Wisconsin. The opportunity, also, to relate to a wide range of people interested in brokering at the national, state, and local level was very meaningful. The focusing of the issues, the organizing of the session and the community environment that you created with your workshop planning counterparts all acted to make this the best workshop I have been to since you sponsored a similar one a year ago."

-- E. Nelson Swinerton
Co-Director, Extended Degree Programs
Madison, Wisconsin

"As I think back over the development of my work over the past year, I realize that in the cases where reports of other writings of mine seem to have made a difference, their effectiveness would have been measurably weakened if I had not had the benefit of the information, insights, and inspirations you have generated through the Dialogue. . . One gets a hell of a lot of material across one's desk in this business. Most of it is junk, but much of it is valuable. Only a very small portion of it is invaluable. Yours is. So thanks."

-- Ronald Gross
Adjunct Professor of Social Thought
New York University

"Sue Maes and I were very excited about the interest in free universities shown at the Dialogue meeting last week. We spent the next two days following up with meetings with people around town. We want to thank you for extending the invitation and making it all possible. I think the opportunity to share some experiences in nonformal learning in a highly visible and respected setting will help a great deal in rounding out the lifelong learning picture; something I believe many people are interested in doing."

-- Bill Draves
FUN--Free University Network
Manhattan, Kansas

"As staff person assigned to development of the lifelong learning legislation for Senator Mondale, I found that the Dialogue provided an important forum for discussion of the issues. It offered both an opportunity for Congressional staff to become better educated about the concept and implications of lifelong learning; and for members of the community interested in lifelong learning to exchange ideas among themselves and with key staff people from Congress and the Federal government. . . There is no question that the Dialogue was a major factor in raising the consciousness of Washington education policymakers and of constituent groups such as the aging, labor and women, about the relevance of the concept to them."

-- Ellen S. Hoffman
Former Staff Director
Senate Subcommittee on Children and Youth

"I thought that the sessions which you conducted for the adult education community were the best thing that has happened in that area in years. Thanks to the PECA Monthly Dialogues, we learned what was going on in Washington and who was doing it."

-- Robert Calvert, Jr.
Chief, Adult and Vocational
Education Surveys Branch
Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare

VI. On PECA's miscellaneous activities.

"Once again I find myself congratulating you and PECA for organizing and conducting a first-rate meeting. Only this time, I must add my personal appreciation, and that of everyone connected with COPA. . . The just completed conference on nontraditional education served as an ideal launching pad for COPA's project. In this instance, as in many others, PECA has admirably fulfilled its purpose of serving as a convening authority for individuals and organizations sharing a common interest in an important social problem. And, as a result, COPA will be much more able to accomplish its project objectives. . . Thank you."

-- Kenneth E. Young
President
The Council on Postsecondary
Accreditation

"I am sure you realized how productive I felt the PECA Seminar on the COPA Project was from my peculiar vantage point. I reported on it enthusiastically to the members of my Subcommittee on Accreditation, both of whom agreed that if the anticipated results were forthcoming from the COPA Project, our group in AASCU had little to fear--and much to gain--from the Project."

-- David E. Sweet
President
Rhode Island College

"I thought the PECA Seminar with the COPA Project was a very useful meeting. As I noted in my remarks, while COPA had its own purpose in bringing together the various groups, I felt that as a participant I learned an awful lot from being present. I think that others at the seminar felt the same way. . . Again, congratulations on a job well done."

-- Louis Rabineau
Director, Inservice Education
Program
Education Commission of the States

"It was good to see you again and particularly to be involved in some of your activities. I much appreciated the opportunity to attend the PEC[illegible]inar on the subject of nontraditional study, and I think the meeting was beneficial both for the accrediting commission representatives as well as for those from other fields. There is never enough of that kind of exchange, and so I am delighted to know that you are facilitating a very important and productive exchange process."

-- Robert Kirkwood
Executive Director
Commission on Higher Education
Middle States Association